



1 temporarily reclassified his position to Cook Lead. Appellant's temporary assignment concluded on  
2 August 23, 1998, and Appellant's position was once again classified as a Food Service Worker  
3 Lead.

4  
5 Subsequent to the conclusion of his temporary assignment, Appellant requested a review of the  
6 temporary allocation of his position for the time period of March 23, 1998 to September 23, 1998.  
7 As a result of the local position review, Appellant's temporary allocation for that period remained  
8 Cook Lead. By letter dated January 29, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department  
9 of Personnel. Appellant requested that his temporary allocation be at the FSS2 level.

10  
11 The Director's determination was issued on August 12, 1999 and concluded that Appellant's  
12 temporary allocation should remain Cook Lead. On September 3, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions  
13 to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the  
14 subject of this proceeding.

15  
16 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that he was temporarily assigned the  
17 duties and responsibilities of the vacant FSS2 position and that Respondent did not review or  
18 reallocate the position prior to his temporary assignment. Appellant also argues that the allocation  
19 of his temporary position should be based on the duties and responsibilities assigned to the position,  
20 not on the duties and responsibilities actually performed. Appellant contends that he was  
21 temporarily assigned supervisory responsibilities for student employees consistent with the FSS2  
22 classification. Appellant further argues that he was entitled to be paid as a FSS2 during the time  
23 period that he performed the duties of the position.

24  
25 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant was not assigned to the  
26 vacant FSS2 position and that he did not assume the full scope of supervisory duties assigned to that

1 position. Rather, Respondent asserts that the documents in the record reflect that Appellant's  
2 immediate supervisor retained supervisory responsibility for the students assigned to catering.  
3 Therefore, Respondent asserts that Appellant's temporary assignment was properly allocated to the  
4 Cook Lead classification.

5  
6 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's temporary assignment was  
7 properly allocated to the Cook Lead classification should be affirmed.

8  
9 **Relevant Classifications.** Cook Lead, class code 4026; and Food Service Supervisor II; class code  
10 4021.

11  
12 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
13 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
14 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
15 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
16 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
17 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
18 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
19 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

20  
21 Appellant has the burden of proving that during his temporary assignment, he was assigned the  
22 duties and responsibilities of the FSS2 position. The documents before the Board show that  
23 Appellant's immediate supervisor retained supervisory responsibility for student employees.  
24 Therefore, Appellant has failed to prove that he was assigned the duties and responsibilities of the  
25 vacant FSS2 position.

Appellant's position was temporarily reallocated to a higher level classification because he was performing higher level duties. These higher level duties consisted of overseeing the hot food production for catering as well as scheduling and training student employees. Lead duties are defined, in part, as the responsibility to "assign, instruct and check the work of others. . . ." as a regular and significant part of the employee's duties. Appellant's responsibilities fell within this definition. (See WAC 251-01-255). In addition, Appellant performed inventory, planned product usage, ordered products, and monitored sanitation standards as described in the Cook Lead classification. Therefore, Appellant's temporary allocation as a Cook Lead should be affirmed.

**Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's determination dated August 12, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

### ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated August 12, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member